

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are presented for examination in this application, of which Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 and 11 are in independent form. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 11-15 have been added to assure Applicant a fuller measure of protection of the scope to which he deems himself entitled.

Initially, Applicant disagrees with the statement in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, since a CPA was filed in this application on January 30, 2003.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,046,820 (Konishi), and Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Konishi '820* in view of U.S. Patent 5,950,036 (Konishi).

The general purpose and nature of the invention, and of the applied prior art, have been discussed adequately in the previous papers in this application, and it is not believed to be necessary to repeat that full discussion here. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify its language, and that claim now is directed to an image processing method comprising inputting output characteristics data corresponding to each of a plurality of output apparatus that output an image, including a reference output apparatus. There are calculated density correction data corresponding to the other output apparatus on the basis of the output characteristics data of the reference output apparatus and the output characteristics data of the other output apparatus, and the calculated density correction data corresponding to each of the output apparatus is managed. The density correction data corresponding to the output characteristics of the other output apparatus are updated according to the output characteristics data of the reference output apparatus.

The Office Action cites col. 6, line 58, to col. 7, line 14, of *Konishi '820* as disclosing that the density value of a sample formed and measured by the printer 2 is sent to the computer 1, and the gradation correction table 16 is thus corrected. Applicant disagrees

with this reading of *Konishi '820*. As is apparent from col. 6, lines 14-57, the above passage states that the gradation correction table of the printer 2 is formed by the computer 1. In other words, even if this suggests that the density table of one device (output device) is formed by another device, it does not teach or suggest updating density correction data corresponding to output characteristics of another output apparatus according to the output characteristics data of a reference output apparatus, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Konishi '820*.

Independent Claims 7, 9 and 10 are apparatus, memory medium and program claims, respectively, corresponding to method Claim 1, and are believed allowable for the same reasons as is Claim 1.

Independent Claim 11 is directed to a processing method for use in a print server, comprising administrating density correction tables of a reference printer and at least a second printer, and updating the density correction table of the second printer in accordance with a change of color reproducibility of the reference printer.

Claim 11 is believed to be allowable over *Konishi '820* for at least the same reasons as is Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37

C.F.R. § 1.116. Entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 28,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN377474 v1